

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

### Acknowledgment of Receipt of Certified Priority

The examiner has yet to acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of priority applications submitted on 25 July 2001 in any Office Action. Applicants thus request the examiner to acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of priority applications.

### Amendment

Independent claims 5, 13, and 18 have been amended to explicitly recite that the operation panel window is separate and discrete from the video windows for clarity. No new matter has been introduced.

### Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ramirez Diaz (USP 6,476,858). Claim 7 now stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Ishida (USP 5,684,969). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

First, independent claims 1, 9, and 17 each call for storing selection history information for each of the windows selected in a storage and changing the size of each of the window display sections based on the selection history information stored in the storage, in response to selection of one of the windows. In rejecting these claims, the examiner asserts that Ramirez Diaz discloses a storage device 305 for storing selection history information for each window display section, and that it would have been inherent for Ramirez Diaz to save the window size preference, relying on the passage set forth in its column 6, lines 55-65.

Applicant disagrees with the examiner's assertion that Ramirez Diaz stores "selection history information." The passage relied upon by the examiner merely states that the window can be resized by dragging the corner of the window or by clicking on the image size control buttons 121, i.e., minimize, maximize, close, as typically manipulated in the conventional MS Windows or Linux operating system. Applicant submits that neither this passage nor any other passage in Ramirez Diaz discloses or suggests saving the window selection history information. Moreover, for the examiner's inherency argument to be proper, Ramirez Diaz must necessarily

save the desired setting to the storage device. That is not the case here since that function need not be present for Ramirez Diaz to operate as disclosed.

The examiner also asserts that Ramirez Diaz discloses changing the size of each of the windows based on the selection history information stored in the storage, in response to selection of one of the windows, relying on the passages set forth in column 2, lines 50-70 and column 7, lines 20-35. Again applicant disagrees. These passages merely state that the window is resizable by the user while maintaining the same aspect ratio. There is no mention anywhere that Ramirez Diaz relies on a stored selection history to size the selected window. Moreover, there is no mention anywhere in Ramirez Diaz for resizing each of the non-selected windows when resizing the selected window. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 clearly distinguish over Ramirez Diaz within the meaning of § 102 and § 103.

Second, independent claims 5, 13, and 18 each call for controlling a display device to display a plurality of windows including a plurality of video windows and an operation panel window that is discrete and separate from the video windows. At least one of the video windows displays an image based on image data output from a video device. The operation panel window displays an operation panel for controlling the video device. These claims further call for changing the size and the display position of the operation panel window corresponding to the video windows in accordance with the size changing of the selected one of the video windows.

In rejecting independent claims 5, 13, and 18, the examiner argues that Ramirez Diaz discloses a video window and an operation panel window 101, 102 for controlling a video device. Again, applicant disagrees with the examiner's assessment because Ramirez Diaz's operation panel icons for controlling the video device is contained within the same video window 103 rather than being separate and discrete from the video window. See Fig. 2 and column 6, lines 55-59. The elements 102, 101 respectively are the main menu of the program currently running and the respective toolbar typical of the MS Windows and Linux operating system. Ramirez Diaz has no separate operation panel window displaying an operation panel of the video device that is associable with all of the video windows. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent claims 5, 13, and 18 also patentably distinguish over Ramirez Diaz within the meaning of § 102 and § 103.

Third, independent claims 19 and 27 each call for moving a selected one of the windows in the indicated movement direction, and displaying the selected one window at an enlarged

size that is larger size than all of the non-selected windows. In rejecting these claims, the examiner again relies on the passages set forth in column 2, lines 50-70, column 6, lines 55-65, and column 7, lines 20-35. In contrast to the examiner's understanding, Ramirez Diaz is completely silent regarding indicating a direction of movement of the selected window, let alone moving the selected window in the indicated direction and enlarging the window size that is larger than all of the non-selected windows. Applicant submits that Ramirez Diaz simply would not have taught moving and enlarging the selected display section as set forth in these claims. Accordingly, applicant submits that these claims also patentably distinguish over the Ramirez Diaz.

Fourth, dependent claim 7 calls for changing the number of operating buttons of the operation panel window in accordance with the size change of the selected window. In rejecting claim 7, the examiner again relies upon Ishida, namely the passage set forth in column 8, lines 26-64, for the proposition that changing the number of operating buttons of the operation panel window in accordance with the size change of the selected windows would have been obvious. As applicant has previously explained, this passage states nothing about changing the number of operating buttons of the displayed window. Rather, it merely discloses scaling down the displayed window. There is no mention anywhere in Ishida regarding changing the number of operating buttons according to the resizing of the window. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 7 further defines over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

20 NOVEMBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)